arXiv:1510.09086v1 [hep-th] 30 Oct 2015

Quasi-Static BMN Solutions

Jens Hoppe*

Abstract

Classical solutions of membrane equations that were recently identified as limits of matrix-solutions are looked upon from another angle.

As extended objects can be described in many different ways, it is not always trivial to note when (and when not) differently looking expressions are describing the same (cp. e. g. [1] where a rather non-trivial graph over the Clifford-torus is derived as a minimal surface in S^3, but is then shown to be, by an explicit, rather intricate reparametrisation, *the* Clifford-torus; cp. also [2, 3] for surfaces involving time-dependent reparametrisations in rotations).

Recently, an interesting paper [4] appeared in which exact solutions to finite N matrix equations were constructed whose $N \to \infty$ limit will here be derived from a "purely-continuum" perspective: one way to solve the canonical equations of motion,

$$\ddot{x}_j = \{\{x_j, x_k\}, x_k\} - x_j + \tfrac{3}{2}\epsilon_{jkl}\{x_k, x_l\}, \tag{1}$$

corresponding to

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \tfrac{1}{2}\int \left(\vec{p}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{3}(x_j - \tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon_{jkl}\{x_k, x_l\})^2\right) \mathrm{d}^2\varphi \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\int \left(\vec{p}^2 + \vec{x}^2 + \sum_{i<j}\{x_i, x_j\}^2 - \epsilon_{jkl}x_j\{x_k, x_l\}\right) \mathrm{d}^2\varphi, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and also satisfying the constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3}\{x_i, \dot{x}_i\} = 0 \tag{3}$$

is to assume $x_3(\tau, \varphi^1, \varphi^2) =: z(\varphi^1)$ to only depend on $\varphi^1 =: \varphi$, and to let

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= u(\varphi)\cos\Omega - v(\varphi)\sin\Omega \\ x_2 &= u(\varphi)\sin\Omega + v(\varphi)\cos\Omega \\ \Omega &= \Omega(\tau, \varphi, \varphi^2) := \varphi^2 + \omega(\varphi)\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

*KTH Royal Institute of Technology.

i. e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\Omega & -\sin\Omega & 0 \\ \sin\Omega & \cos\Omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ z \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

to be quasi-static (the axially-symmetric shape of the surface described by (5) does not depend on τ, the light-cone time).

Inserting (5) into (3) one finds the requirement

$$\omega(\varphi)(u^2+v^2)(\varphi) = \text{const} =: J; \tag{6}$$

writing e. g. $x_a = R_{ab}u_b$ $(a,b=1,2)$ one has

$$\sum_a \{x_a, \dot{x}_a\} = R_{ab}u_b'\omega R_{ac}''u_c - R_{ab}'u_b R_{ac}'(\omega' u_c + \omega u_c'); \tag{7}$$

then differentiate $R_{ab}R_{ac} = \delta_{bc}$ twice with respect to Ω, and use $R_{..}'' = -R_{..}$ to arrive at (6) (which is the analogue of eq. (36) of [4]).

Inserting (5) into (1) and (2) on the other hand gives (with $s := u^2+v^2$, and using (6))

$$\tfrac{1}{2}s'' + \frac{J^2}{s^2} = 1 + z'^2 + 3z' \tag{8}$$

$$(s(z'+\tfrac{3}{2}))' = z \tag{9}$$

$$\frac{E\{\vec{u},z\}}{2\pi} = \tfrac{1}{2}\int \left(\frac{J^2}{s} + (z - \tfrac{1}{2}s')^2 + (1+z')^2 s \right) \mathrm{d}\varphi; \tag{10}$$

the easiest way to derive this is to note that $\dot{x}_1 = -\omega x_2$, $\dot{x}_2 = +\omega x_1$, $\partial_2 x_x = x_1, \partial_2 x_1 = -x_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \{x_2,x_3\} &= -z'x_1 \ (= -x_3'x_1) \\ \{x_3,x_1\} &= -z'x_2 \ (= -x_3'x_2) \\ \{x_1,x_2\} &= x_1x_1' + x_2x_2' \ (= \tfrac{1}{2}s') \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

– which is (cp. [5]) interesting in its own right.

Note that in [4] (8)–(10) are derived as continuum limits of finite matrix expressions, and that (as for the finite N case) the equations of motion of the reduced Hamiltonian coincide with what one gets when inserting (5) into the full equations (1).

The shape of the curve whose rotation, cp. (5), gives the surface in $\mathbf{R}^3$, is given by s (the square of the distance from the z-axis) and z, obtained by solving (8) + (9); e. g.

$$s(\varphi) = \frac{1}{z' + \frac{3}{2}} \left(c + \int_0^\varphi z(\hat{\varphi})\mathrm{d}\hat{\varphi} \right). \tag{12}$$

For spherical surfaces it would actually suffice to calculate s as a function of z. Choosing z (instead of φ) as the variable is motivated also by (11), which after the transformation $\varphi \to \tilde{\varphi} := z(\varphi)$ reads

$$\{x_2,x_3\} = -x_1, \ \{x_3,x_1\} = -x_2, \ \{x_1,x_2\} = \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_{\tilde{\varphi}}s; \tag{13}$$

the corresponding matrix equations (cp. [6, 7]) would make $z = x_3$ canonical, resp. with integer-spaced diagonal entries.

Let me now comment on the "BPS" solutions

$$z' = -1 + \frac{J}{s}, \quad s' = 2z \tag{14}$$

of (8) + (9) (cp. eq. (78)/(79) of [4], and the interpretation given there), which together with their finite N counterparts were thoroughly discussed, and solved, already 10 years ago in [8].

Noting that (2) may also be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H = {} & \tfrac{1}{2}\int p_3^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\int (p_1 \pm (x_2 - \{x_3, x_1\}))^2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\int (p_2 \mp (x_1 - \{x_2, x_3\}))^2 \\ & + \tfrac{1}{2}\int (x_3 - \{x_1, x_2\})^2 \pm \int (x_1 p_2 - x_2 p_1) \pm \int x_3(\{p_1, x_1\} + \{p_2, x_2\}), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

with the last term being zero (because of (3)), and the one before equalling $\pm 2\pi J$, one can identify the BPS equations for fixed J to be

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 + x_2 - \{x_3, x_1\} &= 0 \\ \dot{x}_2 - x_1 + \{x_2, x_3\} &= 0 \\ \{x_1, x_2\} = x_3, \quad \dot{x}_3 &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

which for $\dot{x}_1 = -\omega x_2$, $\dot{x}_2 = \omega x_1$ (cp. (4)) and $\omega = J/s$ (cp. (6)) become

$$\begin{aligned} \{x_3, x_1\} &= (1 - J/s)x_2 \\ \{x_2, x_3\} &= (1 - J/s)x_1 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$\{x_1, x_2\} = x_3, \tag{18}$$

implying in particular

$$\{\{x_3, x_1\}, x_1\} + \{\{x_3, x_2\}, x_2\} = -2x_3 \tag{19}$$

(cp. [8, 9, 10, 11]). Using the same technique by which (18) + (19) were solved in [8], namely changing independent variables from φ^1, φ^2 to x^1, x^2 (cp. [12]), giving

$$\begin{aligned} \{f, x_1\} &= -\hat{z}\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x^2} \\ \{f, x_2\} &= \hat{z}\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x^1}; \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned} -\hat{z}\partial_2 \hat{z} &= (1 - J/s)x_2 \\ -\hat{z}\partial_1 \hat{z} &= (1 - J/s)x_1 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

hence (cp. (82) of [4])

$$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - J\ln(x_1^2 + x_2^2) = \text{const.} \tag{22}$$

describing the shape of the membrane-solution.

References

[1] J. Arnlind, J. Choe, and J. Hoppe, *Classical mechanics of minimal tori in* S^3, arXiv:1307.2255.

[2] J. Hoppe, *Conservation laws and formation of singularities in relativistic theories of extended objects*, hep-th/9503069.

[3] J. Hoppe, *U(1) invariant Membranes and Singularities*, arXiv:0805.4738.

[4] D. Berenstein, E. Dzienkowski, and R. Lashof-Regas, *Spinning the Fuzzy Sphere*, *JHEP* **08** (2015) 134, [arXiv:1506.01722].

[5] J. Arnlind, M. Bordemann, L. Hofer, J. Hoppe, and H. Shimada, *Fuzzy Riemann surfaces*, *JHEP* **06** (2009) 047, [hep-th/0602290].

[6] J. Arnlind, J. Hoppe, and G. Huisken, *Discrete curvature and the gauss–bonnet theorem*, arXiv:1001.2223 • J. Arnlind, J. Hoppe, and G. Huisken, *Multi linear formulation of differential geometry and matrix regularizations*, *J. Diff. Geo.* **91** (2012) 1–40.

[7] J. Arnlind and J. Hoppe, *The world as quantized minimal surfaces*, *Phys. Lett. B* **723** (2013) 397–400.

[8] D. Bak, S. Kim, and K.-M. Lee, *All higher genus BPS membranes in the plane wave background*, *JHEP* **06** (2005) 035, [hep-th/0501202].

[9] D. Bak, *Supersymmetric Branes in the matrix model of a pp wave background*, *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 045017, [hep-th/0204033].

[10] A. Mikhailov, *Nonspherical giant gravitons and matrix theory*, hep-th/0208077.

[11] J. Hoppe and K.-M. Lee, *New BPS configurations of BMN matrix theory*, *JHEP* **06** (2008) 041, [arXiv:0712.3616].

[12] M. Bordemann and J. Hoppe, *The Dynamics of relativistic membranes. 1. Reduction to two-dimensional fluid dynamics*, *Phys. Lett.* **B317** (1993) 315–320, [hep-th/9307036].